

## Meeting Notes

### CEQA Scoping Meeting and Public Workshop

November 7, 2012

10:00 AM -12:00 PM

**Location:** Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Fresno Branch Office  
1685 "E" Street, Fresno, CA, Kings River Room

#### *Attendees:*

Amec Engineering Consultancy and Project Management – Tim Souther

Central Valley Water Board - Anne Littlejohn, Calvin Yang, Jeanne Chilcott, Pam Buford

Kenneth D. Schmidt and Associates – Ken Schmidt

Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group (Dudley Ridge Water District) – Dale Melville

Stoel Rives LLP – Loren J. Harlow

Tulare Lake Drainage District – Mike Nordstrom

#### *Summary of Comments*

*(Note – Central Valley Water Board staff responses will be presented in a separate “Response to Comments” Document)*

The following are comments made regarding the proposed project alternatives:

#### **Alternative 2 – Site Specific Objectives Approach**

- In addition to option 5, this alternative could work for the Tulare Lake Basin for specific constituents.
- Use some type of economic advantage to help both parties navigate through the process. Give flexibility that includes “offsets” or “trades”.
- Could this option be used as a template for the whole region?
- Will this apply in upcoming Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Waste Discharge Requirements?
- Most conservative criterion isn’t always applicable. The Water Board should justify their numbers.

### **Alternative 3 – Water Body Categorical Approach**

- This needs to allow for flexibility so that dischargers are not forced to do individual Basin Plan Amendments. Not sure how to implement this type of flexibility.

### **Alternative 5 – Dededesignate the MUN beneficial use**

- This is a good option for the Tulare Lake Basin with its closed system of constructed channels.
- How is “Ag dominated” going to be defined? How are we going to define a slough versus a ditch?
- What is the default for dedesignating MUN? The Ag community doesn’t want “bad” water, but let them regulate themselves and the quality of water they need for their agriculture.

The following are comments made regarding the overall project:

- Make the project title or description clearer by stating that it is only concerning surface water.
- Tulare Lake Basin is very different from the Sacramento River Basin. It is a closed basin and the water used exclusively for agriculture. Different archetypes should be used for the Tulare Lake Basin.
- Are the Drinking Water Policy( 88-63) and the tributary rule in conflict?
- Farmers are being pushed to recycle water – but tail water in recycling is going to degrade the water. Which is more important?
- Will the dedesignation require a Use Attainability Study?
- Natural water bodies should be the highest priority for the Water Boards.
- Primary use of Ag supply is for irrigation. The existing MUN policy will interfere with Ag supply because the water does not meet MUN standards. Policies may trap farmers from using water.
- If we dedesignate MUN, do other beneficial uses still apply?
- Does USEPA always have jurisdiction over water bodies?
- How will this project work with the 303(d) listing?